



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/773,242	02/09/2004	Hong-Jik Doo	956-1001	7168
38209	7590	05/09/2007		
STANZIONE & KIM, LLP 919 18TH STREET, N.W. SUITE 440 WASHINGTON, DC 20006			EXAMINER JOHNSON III, HENRY M	
			ART UNIT 3739	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/09/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/773,242

Applicant(s)

DOO, HONG-JIK

Examiner

Henry M. Johnson, III

Art Unit

3739

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 May 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 3739

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed January 23, 2007 with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Specification

The incorporation of essential material in the specification by reference to an unpublished U.S. application, foreign application or patent, or to a publication is improper. Applicant is required to amend the disclosure to include the material incorporated by reference, if the material is relied upon to overcome any objection, rejection, or other requirement imposed by the Office. The amendment must be accompanied by a statement executed by the applicant, or a practitioner representing the applicant, stating that the material being inserted is the material previously incorporated by reference and that the amendment contains no new matter. 37 CFR 1.57(f).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 2 is indefinite, as the separation unit is comprised of two separate portions, not a single unit as claimed. The separation unit is not a separate element, but includes elements already cited that are removable. The foot pressure plate is always exposed.

Art Unit: 3739

Claim 3 is indefinite due to the separation unit cited as being equipped with the upper therapy mat and the lower therapy mat. It is not clear how it is "equipped" with both mats. It would appear there is a first separation unit associated with the upper therapy mat and a second separation unit associated with the lower therapy mat. It is clearly not removable as a single unit. A motor part is cited as provided with the foot pressure plate. No such motor has been disclosed. The term "motor part being individually formed on front and back faces" is not clear. Does the applicant intend this to be installed? The term "second assemblies being separated" is not clear. The term removable is suggested.

Claim Objections

Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities: the term "folding state" in line 3 should be folded state. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 13 and 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,947,833 to Yamasaki. Yamasaki discloses a bed-type massaging apparatus having an elongate frame with a middle hinge so that the frame divides the bed into two parts which can be folded one over onto the other (abstract). A pair of roller-type massaging devices are supported on each of the frame halves and include rollers which extend transversely of the bed (abstract). The rollers are interpreted as both spinal corrector and therapy director. The

Art Unit: 3739

massaging devices can be simultaneously moved by a motor in a pattern whereby they are simultaneously moved inwardly toward the center of the bed and then outwardly away from the center of the bed (abstract). Yamasaki teaches a flexible cover (mat) that extends over the upper surface (Col. 3, lines 59-62).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,947,833 to Yamasaki in view of U.S. Patent 2,461,102 to Ackerman. Yamasaki discloses a bed-type massaging apparatus having an elongate frame with a middle hinge so that the frame divides the bed into two parts which can be folded one over onto the other (abstract). A pair of roller-type massaging devices are supported on each of the frame halves and include rollers which extend transversely of the bed (abstract). The rollers are interpreted as both spinal corrector and therapy director. The massaging devices can be simultaneously moved by a motor in a pattern whereby they are simultaneously moved inwardly toward the center of the bed and then outwardly away from the center of the bed (abstract). Yamasaki teaches a flexible cover that extends over the upper surface (Col. 3, lines 59-62). The portion of the cover over one part of the frame is interpreted as the upper therapy mat and the portion over the other as the lower therapy mat. Yamasaki does not disclose a foot pressure plate. Ackerman teaches an apparatus with motor driven rollers that move along a portion of the length of the device (Fig. 1, # 30) and an additional set of rollers at an end of the device that provide pressure to the feet

Art Unit: 3739

of a person lying on the device (Col. 2, lines 41-50). The set of rollers is interpreted as a foot pressure plate. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to incorporate the foot pressure device as taught by Ackerman in the apparatus of Yamasaki to provide a complementary treatment to the torso therapy as Ackerman clearly teach the combination.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,947,833 to Yamasaki in view of U.S. Patent 2,461,102 to Ackerman as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,165,390 to Fleetwood. Yamasaki and Ackerman are discussed above, but do not teach removable panels to access the workings of the device. Fleetwood disclose a massage apparatus with a motor driven massaging means (Col. 2, lines 44-54) and further teaches removable subassemblies or panels to allow access to the interior of the device (Col. 2, lines 24-38). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide internal access as taught by Fleetwood in the invention of Yamasaki in view of Ackerman as providing such access is dictated by common sense to allow serviceability.

Claims 4 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,947,833 to Yamasaki in view of U.S. Patent 6,705,234 to Miller et al. Yamasaki is discussed above, but does not teach a folding structure with a center portion and two end portions. Miller et al. disclose a folding table with a center section (Fig. 1, # 43) and two end portions hinged to the center section (folding part). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the three section folding arrangement as taught by Miller et al. in the invention of Yamasaki as an alternative folding arrangement. A skilled artisan would look to any art with folding tables, beds, etc. to determine an optimal folding means.

Claims 5, 6 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,947,833 to Yamasaki in view of U.S. Patent 6,705,234 to Miller et al. as applied to claims 4 and 14 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,303,018 to Lehmann. Yamasaki

Art Unit: 3739

and Miller et al. are discussed above, but do not teach pads between parts of the foldable portions. Lehmann teaches a folding table with pads between portions of the structure, thus teaching the use of such pads to protect the parts from damage when touching. The teaching is interpreted as the use of pads regardless of the intended use. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use protecting pads as taught by Lehmann in the invention of Yamasaki in view of Miller et al. to reduce wear on the parts or provide a soft interface between parts. One of skill in the art would look to other folding devices to learn of issues or problems regarding the folding and use such solutions as is provided in the prior art.

Claims 7, 8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,947,833 to Yamasaki in view of U.S. Patent 6,705,234 to Miller et al. as applied to claims 4 and 14 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,283,919 to Grant. Yamasaki and Miller et al. are discussed above, but do not teach latching and safety devices for a folding structure. Grant teaches a folding trauma stretcher that includes a support structure for securing the stretcher in an open, unfolded position, the structure including brace arms for preventing the legs from pivoting with respect to the frame assemblies and a stop plate and locking means for preventing the frame members from pivoting with respect to each other (abstract). A hook is disclosed to keep the device from unfolding when in the folded configuration (Fig. 4). The stretcher includes a support framework including linkages, bracing members and stop plates, which secure the frame assemblies when the stretcher is in its open position thereby preventing the open stretcher from collapsing (Col. 3, lines 35-45). Clearly, such a collapse would present a danger to a person's hand and fingers, so the plates serve to reduce that danger. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the various safety features as taught by Grant in the invention of Yamasaki in view of Miller et al. to insure the device maintained a desired configuration and to protect the operator of the device.

Art Unit: 3739

Claims 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,947,833 to Yamasaki in view of U.S. Patent 6,705,234 to Miller et al. as applied to claims 4 and 10 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 3,884,160 to Gutierrez. Yamasaki and Miller et al. are discussed above, but do not teach legs coupled to fold as the table is folded. Gutierrez teaches a folding table with legs that rotate and fold as the table is folded (Fig. 3). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to include the folding legs as taught by Gutierrez in the invention of Yamasaki to provide a more convenient folding arrangement as found in related art.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,947,833 to Yamasaki in view of U.S. Patent 6,705,234 to Miller et al. as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 2,461,102 to Ackerman. All have been previously discussed. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to include the foot pressure plate as taught by Ackerman in the apparatus of Yamasaki in view of Miller et al. to provide a complementary treatment to the torso therapy as Ackerman clearly teach the combination.

Claims 14, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,947,833 to Yamasaki as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,705,234 to Miller et al. Yamasaki is discussed above, but does not teach a folding structure with a center portion and two end portions. Miller et al. disclose a folding table with a center section (Fig. 1, # 43) and two end portions hinged to the center section (folding part). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the three section folding arrangement as taught by Miller et al. in the invention of Yamasaki as an alternative folding arrangement. A skilled artisan would look to any art with folding tables, beds, etc. to determine an optimal folding means.

Art Unit: 3739

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,947,833 to Yamasaki in view of U.S. Patent 6,705,234 to Miller et al. as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 2,461,102 to Ackerman. All have been previously discussed. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to include the foot pressure plate as taught by Ackerman in the apparatus of Yamasaki in view of Miller et al. to provide a complementary treatment to the torso therapy as Ackerman clearly teach the combination.

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,947,833 to Yamasaki as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 2,461,102 to Ackerman. All have been previously discussed. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to include the foot pressure plate as taught by Ackerman in the apparatus of Yamasaki to provide a complementary treatment to the torso therapy as Ackerman clearly teach the combination.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Henry M. Johnson, III whose telephone number is (571) 272-4768. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 6:00 AM to 3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda C. Dvorak can be reached on (571) 272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3739

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Henry M. Johnson, III
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3739